## TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE Transcriber's Office FLOOR DEBATE

March 4, 2003 LR 11, 14

people of the state the opportunity to decide whether they want expanded gaming, this was the way that we had to go. With that, Senator Cudaback, how much time do I have left?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Almost five minutes.

SENATOR JANSSEN: All right. With that, I think I've use up about half the time. And Senator Schimek was a proponent of this and worked hard with trying to get both sides together on this amendment. So with that, I would ask you to please support this amendment. It's the best thing we could come up with. And I would give the remainder of my time to Senator Schimek.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schimek, you have about four minutes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Cudaback, Mr. President, and members. And thank you, Senator Janssen. This has been an issue that has been a long and rather rocky road over the last four years. And during that time, we've explored a lot of different ideas. I think that this is probably, at this moment in time, the best that we can do, considering all the different interests in the state. And believe me, I think there will be strong efforts to undo this amendment should we adopt it here on General File. I think there will be a lot of people out in the lobby who will want to undo what we've done here today. think that this is good public policy, based on several First of all, many of you said, when we different issues. discussed both LR 14CA and LR 11CA, that we should have language that is general in nature, and not too specific. And I could not agree more. What I was always fearful of is that we would not be able to garner enough support to get something passed unless we got specific. Well, this gets specific in a way, but the language is broader, which maybe will satisfy everyone's First of all, this language does take out the interdiction zone. That doesn't mean that any casinos that this state may authorize couldn't be in that interdiction zone. But we're not going to make mention of it in the constitution. Those casinos could be located anywhere in the state, actually, with the provisions of this amendment. The third thing that I think it does is that it limits the amount of gaming that could be authorized in the state. It limits it to eight casinos